From the INTERNATIONAL PRÉLIMINARY EXA  To: OLYNICK, David P. BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, I. P.O. BOX 778 Berkeley, CA 94704-0778 ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE	ACTION: PO	R & THOMAS, LIP  ASSOC: ARD D. TO WPITCH COM. S. ILL/C3  DI BY: SA  DATE of mailing (day/month/year)	PCT WRITTEN OPIN (PCT Rule 66)	······································
Applicant's or agent's file reference		REPLY DUE within 1 / 00 months/days		
IGT1P026.WO  International application No.  International filing date		from the above date of mailing		
PCT/US 02/ 09425	27/03/2002	(uuyimonuniyeur)		monin(year)
International Patent Classification (IPC) or		on and IPC	27/03/2001	
G07F17/32				
Applicant				
IGT				
1. This written opinion is the first drawn up by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.  2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:  1				
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6.  If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.				
4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 27/07/2003				
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/    D-80798 Munich   Tel. (+49-89) 2399-0, Tx: 52365   Tel. (+49-89) 2399-4465   Form PCT/IPEA/408 (cover sheet) (march 2		Authorized officer Examiner Formalities officer (incl. extension of tin Tel. (+49-89) 2399 2		2 20,000 - 20 are

- I. Basis of the opinion
- 1. The basis of this written opinion is the application as originally filed.
- Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability
- In light of the documents cited in the international search report, it is considered that the
  invention as defined in at least some of the claims does not appear to meet the
  criteria mentioned in Article 33(1) PCT, i.e. does not appear to be novel and/or to involve
  an inventive step (see international search report, in particular the documents cited X
  and/or Y and corresponding claims references).
- 2. If amendments are filed, the applicant should comply with the requirements of Rule 66.8 PCT and indicate the basis of the amendments in the documents of the application as originally filed (Article 34 (2) (b) PCT) otherwise these amendments may not be taken into consideration for the establishment of the international preliminary examination report. The attention of the applicant is drawn to the fact that if the application contains an unnecessary plurality of independent claims, no examination of any of the claims will be carried out.
- NB: Should the applicant decide to request detailed substantive examination, then an international preliminary examination report will normally be established directly. Exceptionally the examiner may draw up a second written opinion, should this be explicitly requested.